



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,142	10/09/2001	Ronald J. Biediger	TEX4542P0403US	6739

1942 7590 06/19/2002

ROCKEY, MILNAMOW & KATZ, LTD.  
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, STE. 4700  
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE  
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, BINTA M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1625

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2002

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application N .

09/973,142

Applicant(s)

BIEDIGER ET AL.

Examiner

Binta M. Robinson

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-24 and 27-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19,25,26,30 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

The examiner notes the applicant's election of species of claim 26 at paper no. 4.

The election of species will be used as a reference point for the examiner to and chemical equivalence and restriction will be required under 35 U. S. C. 121.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-19, 25, 26, 30, 31, drawn to the compound in claim 1 where R1 is H, R6 is carbocyclicarylalkyl, E is N, J is O, S, or NR8, A is NR6, Y is C(R1), W is C and Y and W come together to form a phenyl group that is substituted with the moieties claimed except heterocyclic moieties, and A, and R6 come together to form a pyridine ring, T, M, and L are as claimed, and X are all substituents claimed except tetrazolyl, R4 is carbocyclicaryl, classified in class 546, subclass 297.
- II. Claims 1-30, drawn to the compound in claim 1 where R1, E, J, R6, A, Y, and X are all other moieties not claimed in group I, classified in various classes and subclasses

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

In the instant case the different inventions have achieved a separate status in the art, have separate fields that aren't coextensive, and are capable of supporting separate patents. Further, a prior art reference that would anticipate the claims under 35 USC 102(b) would not render obvious the same claim(s) under 35 U. S. C. 103 (a)

Art Unit: 1625

with respect to another member. Searching the entire genus would be a burden on the USPTO in terms of time and expense.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

If the applicant chooses to prosecute group II in a divisional application, group II may be subject to further restriction.

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-19, 25, 26, 30, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for the radicals B, *R<sup>1</sup>, R<sup>4</sup>, R<sup>5</sup>, heterocyclyl or heterocycloalkyl, alky/heterocyclyl* ~~R1-R17 forming all heterocycloalkyl rings, or L, NR11, R4, R11 forming all rings, or when M is C(R9)(R10), M, R9 and R10 forming all rings, or when A is NR6, A, Y=CR1, R1 and R6 coming together to form all possible rings. These rings being formed with electron withdrawing groups in the ortho position have also not been enabled, since rings with only electron withdrawing groups in the meta position have been synthesized. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims as recited are broader than the scope of~~

Art Unit: 1625

enablement. The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. The applicant is referred to *In re Wands*, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in *Ex parte* Foreman 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

reasons

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In *re Wands*, 858 F. 2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In terms of factor 3 and 5, the state of the art and the level of predictability in the art cannot be predicted with any certainty beyond what specific test compounds /compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents should be used and are likely to provide productive results beyond those therapeutic compounds/compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents taught in the specification. Only examples 1-38 were tested for their affects on inhibiting binding to alpha 4 beta 1 integrin.

in terms of factors 4 and 6, the inventor provides no guidance beyond the therapeutic compound/compositions and/or therapeutic agents as taught in the specification as previously mentioned. As a result one of ordinary skill in the art could not predict what other types of therapeutic compounds/compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents, other than those taught in the specification; and with regards to the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Wands factor, while the existence of working examples are limited to the aforementioned compounds/compositions as taught in the specification (example 1-38), an indeterminate quantity of experimentation would be necessary to determine all potential therapeutic compounds/compositions' effects on inhibition of alpha 4 beta 1 integrin.

In terms of the 8<sup>th</sup> Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of predictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by the inventor. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101, which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefore ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and

*In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-19 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1-19, respectively of copending Application No. 09707068. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim 25 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 27 of copending Application No. 09707068. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binta M. Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5437. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alan Rotman can be reached on (703)308-4698. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308 7922 for regular communications and (703)308-7922 for After Final communications.



**ALAN L. ROTMAN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600**